

Serial No.: 10/678,901

Remarks/Arguments**35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In response, claims 10 and 11 have been amended to depend from claim 9.

35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 were rejected as being anticipated by Dries (U.S. Patent No. 1,886,473). The applicant disagrees with this rejection, however, has amended claim 1 to include sufficient limitations of claim 6 deemed to be allowable subject matter by the Office. The amendment to claim 1 thus moots the rejection of claim 1-5.

Claims 1-3 were rejected as being anticipated by Kronseder (U.S. Patent No. 5,743,377). These rejections are also mooted in light of the claim amendments.

Claims 9-11 were rejected as being anticipated by Schroder, however, this rejection is also mooted by the addition of claim elements to claim 9.

Conclusion

The Office deemed claim 6 to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Substantially all of the elements of claim have been included in amended claims 1 and 9. It is submitted, therefore, that all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Rutan & Tucker, LLP

Dated: March 15, 2005By: Robert D. Fish
Reg. No. 33,880

Attorneys for Applicant(s)
Post Office Box 1950
Costa Mesa, CA 92628-1950
Tel: (714) 641-5100
Fax: (714) 546-9035